DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 481 PS 021 848

TITLE	HIPPY: Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters. Proceedings of the HIPPY International Research Seminar (1st, Jerusalem, Israel, December 16-19, 1991).
INSTITUTION	Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem (Israel). National Council of Jewish Women Research Inst. for Innovation in Education.
PUB DATE	Jul 93
NOTE	48p.; Co-sponsored by the Averroes Foundation, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Research; Followup Studies; Foreign Countries; *Home Instruction; Longitudinal Studies; Management Information Systems; *Parents as Teachers; *Preschool Education; *Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	Israel

ABSTRACT

The first international research seminar based on the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) brought together researchers involved in national studies relating to HIPPY, educators, policy planners, and HIPPY staff. This seminar proceedings begins with the opening remarks of Chaim Adler, Benjamin Amir, Avima Lombard, and Tonny van den Berg. Next, reports by eight HIPPY participants are presented, including: (1) Sevda Bekman, who described longitudinal and follow-up studies of HIPPY in Turkey; (2) Mervyn Skuy, who discussed the effectiveness of HIPPY within two disadvantaged communities in South Africa; (3) Lotty van den Berg-Eldering, who discussed the methodology of research involving Dutch, Surinamese, Turkish, and Moroccan mothers and their 4-year-old children; (4) Pieter Appelhof, who reported on a study to evaluate Holland's Educational Priority Policy, which targets deprived areas; (5) Dan Davis, who detailed an evaluation of HIPPY conducted in Israel in the late 1970's; (6) Chaya Piotrkowski, who described the HIPPY Research Consortium in the United States and evaluated three U.S. HIPPY programs; (7) Raymond Collins, who described the HIPPY computerized Management Information System (MIS); and (8) David Weikart, who reviewed studies of the long-term impact of preschool projects. The next sections summarize group discussions, subjects for further study, and possibilities for shared research. The proceedings concludes with a summary of decisions and list of participants. (AC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HIPPY
HOME INSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR PRESCHOOL YOUNGSTERS

ED 369 481

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Avima Lombard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The National Council of Jewish Women
Research Institute for Innovation in Education
School of Education
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

PS 021848

Proceedings of the First HIPPY International Research Seminar

December 16-19, 1991

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education was established in 1968, by the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), U.S.A., at the School of Education of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, with the goal of carrying out research and creating innovative educational programs directed at the education of the socially at-risk segments of the Israeli population. Through a wide range of research and applied activities, the Institute aims to address the special educational problems and needs of children and youth, and thereby promote their educational and social advancement. The main goal is to provide youngsters with opportunities to develop their potential, to attain social mobility and to fully participate in Israeli society. The accumulated knowledge and expertise attained through these activities lead to the Institute's professional contribution to deliberations associated with public educational policy.

Since the Institute's inception, research has been conducted and projects implemented in the areas of:

Early Childhood Education
Education in the Family and the Community
Intervention in the School and Its Evaluation
School Integration
Technological and Vocational Education
Teacher Training
Youth and Informal Education
Educational Recovery and Second-Chance
Immigrant Absorption
Cross-Cultural Research
and Developmental Research.

The Institute has ongoing relationships with researchers and research institutes in Israel and in other countries. The findings of research projects are published as articles in scientific journals, as books and as monographs.

HIPPY

HOME INSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR PRESCHOOL YOUNGSTERS

Proceedings of the First HIPPY International Research Seminar

December 16-19, 1991

The National Council of Jewish Women
Research Institute for Innovation in Education
School of Education
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

HIPPY: HOME INSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR PRESCHOOL YOUNGSTERS

Proceedings of the First HIPPY International Research Seminar

December 16-19, 1991

The National Council of Jewish Women
Research Institute for Innovation in Education
School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Israel

July 1993

Co-sponsored by the Averroes Foundation, The Netherlands

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST HIPPY INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH SEMINAR

CONTENTS

Introduction 7

Opening Remarks 8
Prof. Chaim Adler, Israel 8
Mr. Benjamin Amir, Israel 8
Prof. Avima Lombard, Israel 9
Ms. Tonny van den Berg, The Netherlands 9

Reports of Participants 11
Dr. Sevda Bekman, Turkey 11
Prof. Mervyn Skuy, South Africa 14
Prof. Lotty van den Berg-Eldering, The Netherlands 17
Drs. Pieter Appelhof, The Netherlands 22
Prof. Dan Davis, Israel 25
Dr. Chaya Piotrkowski, United States 27
Dr. Raymond Collins, United States 30
Dr. David Weikart, United States 32

Group Discussion 35
Subjects for Further Study 37
Shared Research Possibilities 39
Summary of Decisions 47
List of Participants 48

INTRODUCTION

The first HIPPY International research seminar took place in Jerusalem at the Hebrew University NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education from December 16- 19, 1991.

The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) was initiated as a field research project in Israel in 1969, and extensive data on its implementation and effects were generated at that time. HIPPY has been operating internationally since 1983 and as local evaluations are part of the plan of implementation in each country, data on the effectiveness of the program and its operation outside of Israel became available by 1988. While there had been no coordinated effort for planning evaluations which would yield comparable data, each program was asked to study the extent to which HIPPY succeeded in preparing children for school entry. Other issues included in the various research plans ranged from specific skills or knowledge acquired by the children and other participants, to the processes involved in the operation of HIPPY.

At the invitation of the Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture, the heads of HIPPY programs around the world met in The Netherlands in October, 1990, to exchange information and to focus on issues which appear to be central to the different national programs. All the delegates expressed a strong desire for a serious exchange of information on research relating to HIPPY - an exchange which might lead to a plan for coordinated research on an international scale. The first HIPPY International Research Seminar, was convened a little more than a year later, having been delayed somewhat by the Gulf War in the first part of 1991.

Seminar participants were researchers who had been directly involved in national research relating to HIPPY, educators and policy planners whose interest in HIPPY stemmed from its relevance in meeting the needs of locally defined educationally disadvantaged children, and members of the Israeli and the International HIPPY staff.

Seminar participants visited HIPPY programs in different locations around the country, observing the program in operation with native-born Israeli Jews and Arabs, as well as with immigrants from Ethiopia. Discussions of the research presented by each participant were chaired by the participants, in turn, focusing on clarification of the specific research reported and seeking to identify factors common to all the studies.

This summary of the proceedings recorded during the seminar is expected to be a first step toward the creation of a forum for planning and putting into action a program of coordinated research on HIPPY around the world.

OPENING REMARKS

Prof. Chaim Adler
Director, The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education
Israel

The NCJW Research Institute is unique in that it has not only been committed to the publication of quality research, but has also been equally committed to program development and "real work" in the educational arena. This "marriage" between the real world and intellectual endeavor is valuable.

The last ten years have witnessed numerous efforts to implement HIPPY abroad, beginning with a small international meeting held in Israel in 1981, supported by the Ford Foundation.

Turkey was the first to implement the program, followed a year later by the United States and the Netherlands, with South Africa, Chile and other countries joining later on. It is highly satisfying that Israel, which is so frequently in the news for its political behavior, could also do something for young children in other parts of the world that may have an impact on their well-being. HIPPY programs are starting this year in Mexico, Germany and New Zealand, all at the request of these countries, and not as a result of lobbying efforts. Of course, the transplanting of a program created in a particular socio-cultural environment into other very different settings is not problem-free. It is therefore imperative to ascertain whether HIPPY is as valuable when implemented in other countries as it is in Israel. International collaboration is an important means of examining this question.

Mr. Benjamin Amir
Director, The Pedagogical Secretariat
The Ministry of Education and Culture
Israel

Educators are optimists, in that they believe in the right of every child to an education, and strive to keep that promise. HIPPY's Hebrew acronym, HAETGAR, which literally means "the challenge," is a key word in education. The challenges that educators face today include: coping with problems that arise in a modern democratic society, leaving the ivory tower in order to intervene in educational practice, and trying unconventional ways to advance disadvantaged students. The Israeli Ministry of Education and Culture has been sponsoring Israel's HIPPY program for more than 15 years. One of the

program's most important features is its built-in process of continuous evaluation and its commitment to implementing appropriate modifications in accordance with changing circumstances. The present workshop is yet another commendable example.

Prof. Avima Lombard
Initiator of the HIPPY Program in 1968
The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education
Israel

It is hoped that this meeting of HIPPY researchers from different parts of the world will provide a fairly comprehensive picture of what is known about HIPPY today, and enable researchers to draw some conclusions about the program. The workshop may also serve as a forum to determine what researchers would still like to know about HIPPY, and to come up with strategies to obtain this information either as individual researchers or through a collaborative group effort.

The conference is co-sponsored by the NCJW Research Institute and the Dutch Averroes Foundation, which operates a nationwide HIPPY program in the Netherlands. The foundation director, Boudewijn Bekkers, was unable to attend the conference due to illness. Filling in for him is Tonny van den Berg.

Ms. Tonny van den Berg
National Coordinator of HIPPY/OPSTAP in Holland
Averroes Foundation
The Netherlands

Holland is well on its way to becoming a multi-ethnic society, and HIPPY is one of several projects sponsored by the Averroes Foundation which is meant to help eliminate some of the hurdles faced by various ethnic groups. HIPPY was initiated in Holland in 1986, on an experimental basis, by the Foundation, which is also responsible for its implementation and which cooperates closely with the Hebrew University. Thanks to the support of the Dutch Ministry of Welfare, Health and Culture, HIPPY now reaches 3,000 mothers and children. Five years of experience have shown that HIPPY is workable, reaches otherwise inaccessible groups, and evokes enthusiasm in mothers, children and paraprofessionals alike. Of course, these impressions need to be backed by scientific proof.

There are two important requirements of stimulation programs: effectiveness and workability. The former refers to the extent to which the educational gap is diminished, and the extent to which the project leads to parents' understanding and involvement in their children's education. The latter refers to whether or not the program is structured in such a way that children and mothers can handle it. According to a recently published Dutch

research report, which lists conditions that must be met if a stimulation program is to be effective, intervention must be intensive, long-term, start early, aim for clear developmental targets, have mother-child interaction aimed at linguistic stimulation and have strong structure. These conditions have more to do with process than with pedagogical theory. Research must be aimed at improving the aforementioned conditions so that the HIPPY program can be implemented more successfully.

REPORTS OF PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Sevda Bekman
Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

Two interrelated studies have been carried out in Turkey. First, longitudinal research on HIPPY was conducted between 1982 and 1986. Second, a follow-up study is presently underway; it began in the fall of 1991.

DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Participating children in the initial study (255 children) came from three different settings in low- income areas of Istanbul: educational preschool centers, custodial preschool centers and home care. Children in the sample were not recruited into the centers, but rather were randomly selected from existing attendees. There were also two different age groups: children who were three years old at the start of the research, and those who were five years old at that time. The mean age of mothers was 29, that of fathers was 32. The mothers had an average of 5.36 years of schooling, while the average for the fathers was 5.81 (five years of education is mandatory in Turkey). Two thirds of the mothers were employed - half of these were unskilled workers, and most of the other half were semi-skilled. Three quarters of the families were made up of nuclear units (no extended family members living with the parents and children). The mean number of children per family was 2.6. No difference was found in employment and educational levels between families from the three different settings.

Some of the mothers (20-25) dropped out of the study at the very beginning. The main reason for these dropouts was apparently the mothers' inability to arrange their time. A second reason was pressure from mothers-in-law who objected to the program. However, once the program was underway, there were no dropouts. Moreover, the HIPPY program was later applied for field practice (rather than research purposes) in one of the same low-income areas of Istanbul in which the original research project had been implemented. There were fewer dropouts this time, possibly because the neighborhood had heard about the program and its benefits through word-of-mouth.

IMPLEMENTATION

The HIPPY intervention in Turkey had two major aims: to foster cognitive development through HIPPY worksheets and story books, and to sensitize mothers to the development of the child through group discussions. These group meetings, aimed at enrichment of the mothers, are unique to HIPPY in

Turkey. Together with the local program coordinator, mothers cover such topics as: the importance of learning at an early age, the role of the mother and family in the development of the young child, social and cognitive development characteristics, the importance of play, and positive and negative forms of discipline. The goal is not only to transmit knowledge, but also to decide what to apply at home, and to discuss the results of efforts at applying new learning at home.

The home intervention network included the university research team, the five local coordinators (one for each low-income area of Istanbul taking part in the study) and the mothers. Working mothers had their group discussions in the factories where they were employed, while non-working mothers attended the sessions at either mother health centers or adult education centers.

Fathers were invited at the beginning of the program, and were told of the advantages that they and their children would gain. Occasionally they were invited to group meetings, during which they could discuss their feelings about the program. They also met at the end of the intervention. In other words, they were not officially involved in the training aspects of the program, but efforts were made to keep them aware of what was going on.

MEASURES

In the first year of the four-year project, the researchers obtained base-line assessments. HIPPY was then implemented for two years. In the fourth year, the researchers re-evaluated participants using the same measures as in the first year.

There were four main areas of assessment: cognitive development of the child, personality and social development, mother variables and family variables. Cognitive measures included IQ tests, achievement tests, and school grades at the time of retesting, when the younger group was in first grade and the older group in second grade. Measures of social development focused on such elements as the child's self-concept, adjustment to school, aggressiveness, and tendency to need help. Mother variables included: how frequently mothers pay full attention to the child other than at mealtime, how often the mother tells stories or reads to the child, whether she is pleased with autonomous behavior, whether she expects the child to be successful at school, and whether she expresses verbal pleasure and appreciation.

It should be noted that data on mother variables were obtained through self-reports. This, of course, raises the risk that the mothers would wish to please the researchers, leading to reports that were "just too wonderful" to be true. However, there was no real reported difference in mother-child interaction among non-HIPPY mothers. This question will be dealt with more comprehensively in the follow-up research.

RESULTS

The research found that HIPPY children had significantly higher scores in all cognitive tests than those who had not been in the program, regardless of the learning context (educational, custodial or home care). They also did significantly better on achievement tests in general ability. In mathematics, there was a trend in the expected direction, with a significant difference for the younger group only. Achievement tests in Turkish revealed a positive, though non-significant effect. School grades were significantly higher for HIPPY children with regard to both overall average and grades in Turkish. A near-significant positive effect was found in social studies and mathematics.

There was a near-significant difference in school adjustment and dependency. Personality and social development outcomes showed some significant differences. Specifically, HIPPY children asked for help less, were less aggressive, and had a higher self-concept.

Measures of the mothers showed that those who had participated in HIPPY had better and more interactions with their children. HIPPY mothers had a better relationship and better interaction with their children, higher aspirations, higher expectations, and more use of verbal advice in their discipline. It should be noted that, at the start of the program, all mothers valued obedience, inflicted more physical and verbal punishment, did not read or tell stories, and tended to leave their children to play alone, interacting with them only during mealtime.

The HIPPY mothers also had more optimistic expectations of life due, they reported, to the education they had received. Their relationship with their husbands also changed. The mothers shared decisions much more with their husbands, communicated better, were more involved in training and disciplining children, and shared more activities with their spouses. For instance, 62.2% of HIPPY mothers said that they, rather than their husbands, made the decision of whether or not to buy an expensive household item, compared to 51.3% of non-participating mothers. The same trend emerged on questions such as who decides on the number of children; and on the use of birth control.

FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Of the 255 original children from 1986, the researchers traced 226 in fall 1991. Most had started senior high school, a turning point in their education. School records and achievements are expected to provide a record of the differences between groups.

Measures of child variables will include, for example, interviews with the child, interviews with the mother, report cards from grade 1 up to the present, and vocabulary tests.

The study will look at such indicators as the child's social integration, commitment to school, autonomous behavior, reading habits, and perception of family harmony. Measures of mother and family variables will be obtained through interviews with the mother. They will cover the mother's perception of the child's social integration, intelligence and achievement, problems at school, delinquency behavior, role in the family, the environment at home, the woman's life satisfaction, family harmony, and the mode of mother-child communication.

Prof. Mervyn Skuy
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

As the wall of apartheid crumbles, South Africa now stands at a critical crossroads that could lead to hope through the emergence of an egalitarian, viable society, or fear based on conflict and tyranny. The choice will depend in part on the extent to which educators succeed in developing people cognitively, morally and spiritually. One of the problems is the vast educational, social and political deprivation of most of the population. The disenfranchised make up more than four fifths of the population; they include indigenous Africans (76%); coloreds (8.5%) and Asians (2.5%). Yet, only 2% of these sectors (together known as blacks) attend organized pre-schools (as opposed to one third of all white children), making up only 30% of the pre-school population.

One major reason for the non-attendance of pre-schools by those who need it most is a government policy which makes such education the responsibility of the family. Most black families are ill-equipped to cope with this responsibility because of oppression and political harassment, poor living conditions, high unemployment, the disintegration of the extended family, cultural confusion, loss of self-esteem, a high birth rate and an increasing crime rate. The result is tremendous educational deprivation.

Under such conditions, home-based educational programs are critical. HIPPY was one of the first to be formally introduced in South Africa. The University of the Witwatersrand was asked to monitor the progress of HIPPY and, in this respect, served as an independent research unit. The aim of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of HIPPY among disadvantaged communities in South Africa.

STUDY POPULATIONS

Two projects were chosen: an African group (Soweto) and a colored group (Bosmont). The former were either semi- skilled, unskilled or unemployed and very poor. The latter were semi-skilled to skilled, and with relatively high

SES for a colored area. The dropout rate for Soweto was 78.6%, leaving 12 children (40 in control). That for Bosmont was 20.8%, leaving 38 children (40 in control). Children (all groups, including controls) were aged 3 years, 6 months to 4 years, 3 months at start, and 6 years, 3 months to 6 years, 5 months at post-test. Independent variables were both objective measures (school readiness, language development and scholastic skills) and teacher ratings of scholastic skills.

The control groups were selected randomly from the same catchment areas and then matched for age, socio-economic status, language and interest in the program. There was no pre-testing because it was felt that the children were too young to yield reliable results.

PROCEDURE

Coordinators underwent a two-week training period, overseen by Prof. Avima Lombard. They then trained the paraprofessional aides both before and during the program.

The HIPPY program was implemented for two years from 1988-89 (this was the first HIPPY program introduced in South Africa; there have been several since). Mothers were instructed to use English with their children when implementing the program. This is the vernacular for the colored group of Bosmont, but not for the African group of Soweto (where the native tongue is Bothu or Zulu). In practice, the use of English among Soweto mothers varied from those who adhered strictly to it, even when the child did not understand anything, to those who were very flexible, translating to the vernacular. In South Africa, English is regarded as the "language of aspiration," and the passport to freedom. While primary school is taught in the vernacular, high school is taught in English. Thus, there was the challenge of finding the balance between the vernacular, which people are comfortable in, and English, towards which they aspire. The study unfortunately did not examine such process variables as the language that mothers use to communicate with their children in different circumstances. This is one of the crucial variables that is now being examined.

MEASURES

Three measures were employed:

1. A South African Aptitude Test for School Beginners (ASB), comprised of eight sub-tests: gestalt, memory, numerical, perceptual, reasoning, spatial, verbal comprehension and coordination. The ASB has a reliability coefficient of .74-.93 and predictive validity of .30-.45 for first-year results.
2. The Myklebust Pupil Rating Scale (MPRS), for which there is evidence of reliability, validity and predictability in the USA and South Africa.

This entails teacher ratings of verbal and non-verbal scholastic skills, used to assess learning problems among at-risk children.

3. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), a test of receptive vocabulary (reliability = .73-.91).

Post-testing occurred eight weeks after the start of the school year in 1990. Testing on the aptitude tests was in groups of 12. For individual testing on the vernacular for the Peabody Test, Soweto children were tested in Zulu or Sothu, and Bosmont children were tested in English.

RESULTS

The experimental group of Soweto (the 20 percent who remained in the program until the end) performed significantly better on the ASB (Aptitude Test for School Beginners) than did the control group. This was true for seven of the eight sub-tests (the exception was coordination). In the Bosmont group, HIPPY had a significant effect on ASB scores for five of the eight sub-tests.

A question arose as to whether there was a differential dropout rate that affected results (i.e., whether those who remained in the experimental program were the ones more likely to succeed). However, as the study is based on the assumption of matched experimental and control groups, the results are still meaningful. While it is possible that HIPPY interacted with a certain quality of family, nonetheless significant differences were found not only for the Soweto group, where dropout rates were high, but also in the Bosmont group, in which the dropout rate was only 20%.

Because the ASB is normed for each population group, the researchers were able to examine the extent to which the HIPPY program has an impact on participants in relation to the norms of their particular group and in comparison to other groups. As the Bosmont groups (both experimental and control) were above the norm for coloreds, only results for the Africans are given here.

Overall, the Soweto children went from an average score (across sub-tests) of 2.75 without intervention to 3.40 with intervention, with 3 being the mean score for Africans in general. With respect to specific sub-tests, HIPPY raised the level from below average (control scores) to average (experimental scores), as compared to their own African group, for the perception, spatial and verbal comprehension tests. Further, whereas control scores were below average in the memory and numerical tests, in relation to Africans, HIPPY children had mean post-test scores that were average for Africans. The experimental group also did better than the control group in comparison to norms for coloreds and whites on the numerical, perception and spatial sub-tests.

Results on the MPRS pointed to a significant change for the Bosmont group in overall pupil ratings, but only a non-significant positive change for the Soweto group (possibly because of its small size). Similarly, a highly significant change was found for the colored sample on the PPVT, as opposed to no significant change for the African sample.

POINTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

It is clear that certain factors need to be considered in the future when implementing a HIPPY program in an area as deprived as Soweto. These include:

- Lack of motivation of parents who are simply trying to survive;
- Over-crowding, poverty and unemployment;
- Extra demands made on coordinators and aides who had to be especially dedicated, involved and organized;
- Greater length of time required to implement the program;
- The language medium (English or vernacular or some combination of the two);
- The need to consider the discrepancy between the mothers' experience and language ability, on the one hand, and the program materials, on the other.

It should be noted that there were certain limitations inherent in the implementation, due to the inexperience of the organizers and coordinators, as well as materials that were not well adapted to the target population. In addition, the study had certain shortcomings in terms of design and measurement. Testing was of immediate effects on the children (no assessment was made of effects on parents or aides), with respect to specific skills and teacher perceptions, as opposed to performance and academic results. Moreover, there was no pre-test or any comparison of HIPPY to other programs.

Prof. Lotty van den Berg-Eldering

Leiden University, The Netherlands
Conducted the first and longest study of HIPPY in the Netherlands

As the research study is not in a sufficiently advanced stage to discuss conclusions, the focus will be on the research design and implementation.

BACKGROUND

Since the 1950s, Holland has had several waves of immigrants from former colonies and from Mediterranean countries, particularly Morocco and Turkey. The former came mostly for educational and political reasons, the latter for economic ones. Today Surinamese, Antilleans, Turks and Moroccans are the

most important immigrant groups, numbering 680,000 or 5.5% of the total Dutch population. Most of the African minority groups consist of first-generation immigrants and their children, and are highly concentrated in four major cities. Recent studies have shown that most Moroccan and Turkish children, regardless of whether they were born in the Netherlands, are socialized in the language of their parents (Berber, Moroccan Arabic or Turkish) and have an inadequate proficiency of Dutch upon entering primary school.

Until the 1980s, there had been a two-track educational policy based on the assumption that the immigrant children would not stay permanently in the Netherlands. However, in 1985, a new educational priority policy came into effect based on equal educational opportunity for immigrants and native Dutch children. At the same time, there is growing importance attached to preschool education in Holland. The Ministry of Welfare, Public Health and Culture began funding and implementing the HIPPY program, renamed OPSTAP, in 1987.

The OPSTAP program began as an experiment involving Dutch, Surinamese, Turkish and Moroccan mothers and their four-year-old children. The project consists of two interrelated parts: development and implementation, on the one hand, and evaluation, on the other. The two main goals of the experiment are: to see whether the HIPPY program can be transferred to ethnic minority groups in Holland, and to study the effects of the program on participating children and mothers. In order to compare the program's implementation cross-culturally, it was decided to begin with three ethnic groups: Dutch, Turkish and Surinamese. Moroccans were originally excluded because of their high rate of illiteracy and complicated language situation. However, as participation of Moroccan mothers was a sine qua non for ministry funding, because of their extremely disadvantaged position, they were included in the program at a later stage.

DESIGN

There are two types of evaluation of the OPSTAP project: summative and process. This approach was based on the rationale that there was virtually no experience in the Netherlands with home-based educational programs for ethnic minority families, and even less with evaluation of such programs.

A quasi-experimental design was chosen for the summative part of the evaluation. The experimental children were tested at the beginning and end of the program. The researchers introduced the tests in the children's primary language: Dutch, Moroccan Arabic, and Turkish. The test outcomes of the experimental children were compared with those of control children.

The main criteria for recruiting mothers and children into the HIPPY program was ethnicity, mother's educational level (no more than a diploma from

junior high school), and the child's age (between 4 and 4 and six months at the start of the program). Control children were matched for neighborhood, school, ethnicity, age, sex, and mother's educational level.

Experimental and control children were tested for cognitive and language development and on cross-cultural behaviors. Most of the pre- and post-tests were developed in the Netherlands, thus facilitating a comparison between the ethnic children and Dutch children.

The major instrument for examining mother and family data was the home inventory, administered both before and after the program. That is, data were obtained from an interview with the mothers, as well as from observation of mother-child interaction. This was carried out by the project coordinators, who visited all the mothers in the neighborhood during the recruitment phase, providing information about the program and collecting demographic data on the family. In addition, more qualitative data were collected by researchers during in-depth interviews at home. Issues discussed with the mothers (in their own language) included: the migration pattern of the family, the mother's feelings about the immigration, her situation within the family and the community, the family's values and aspirations regarding the education of the children.

Process data were collected by project coordinators, home visitors and researchers. Every week the home visitor filled in a questionnaire about the activities of the mother and child in the previous week. This weekly monitoring provided executive and research staff with information on the progress of the participating mothers and on the impact of the program on communication. The relatively rigid structure of the HIPPY program, as well as the weekly monitoring, demanded a high level of discipline of the executive staff. Moreover, monthly meetings of the executive and research staff gave researchers insight into various aspects of the implementation process, such as recruitment of mothers and paraprofessionals, dropouts, and progress of the program.

IMPLEMENTATION

Recruitment

The executive staffs of baby clinics, which periodically examine all children in the Netherlands from birth until four years of age, were asked to help select candidates who met the criteria. This request for cooperation was made by the management team of the municipal Youth Health Institution in Amsterdam. The success of this effort varied. The district nurses contacted the Dutch and Surinamese mothers to arrange a visit from the project coordinator. Most of the Dutch mothers responded positively. For logistic reasons, it was more difficult to reach the Surinamese mothers, but when contact was finally made, they reacted enthusiastically to the program. Efforts to involve Turkish and Moroccan mothers were least successful; only

a few mothers came during consulting hours, and most were unwilling to allow a project coordinator to visit them at home.

This resistance can be explained by unfamiliarity with the program and suspicion of intervention in family affairs. Anxious to preserve their own religious and cultural identity, many immigrants view the family norms and values propagated by the Dutch educational system as threatening. It is likely, however, that this resistance would disappear over time as the program is implemented on a larger scale and as more information is disseminated to the families, particularly the fathers, in their own language.

Demographic Characteristics

A total of 141 mother-child pairs participated in the OPSTAP project at its beginning. There were at least 150 in the control group. The Moroccan families had the highest number of children, the Dutch, the lowest. The unemployment rate of the fathers differed significantly among the various ethnic groups in the program; while the average was 31%, it was 11% for the Dutch, 48% for the Turkish, and 61% for the Moroccans. Three fourths of all the mothers were unemployed.

The average number of years of schooling for mothers was 7.4 years. This too differed greatly among the ethnic groups, with the Dutch averaging 10 years, the Surinamese, 5.1, the Turks 5.8, and the Moroccans 1.8. Moreover, 75% of the Moroccan mothers were illiterate. Most families were nuclear units, with a few single parents among the Dutch and Surinamese.

Language

Most of the Surinamese and Moroccan families were bilingual (speaking both Dutch and the mother tongue), whereas most of the Turkish families were unilingual. This can be partially attributed to the fact that many of the Turkish children in the program were the first or second child in the family, while many Moroccan children were the third or fourth child. The program organizers decided to offer HIPPY in the mother's native language for several practical, linguistic and political reasons. Firstly, most Moroccan and Turkish mothers had little command of the Dutch language. Secondly, children must learn and think in a first language before they can acquire a second one. Thirdly, Dutch educational policy advocates bilingualism. However, the use of the native tongue created several problems for the Moroccan families. For one thing, Moroccan Arabic and Berber, the languages spoken at home by Moroccans, have no written version. For another, most Moroccan mothers were illiterate, i.e., unable to read either standard Arabic or Dutch. For practical reasons, it was therefore decided to offer the illiterate and semi-literate Moroccan mothers written material in Dutch. It was hoped that older siblings attending Dutch schools would help the

mothers. Obviously, the various languages used in the program posed a problem for evaluating language development of the children. Consequently, language skills were examined by a test for Dutch oral language proficiency (administered to all the children), and an aptitude test in Turkish vocabulary (administered to the Turkish children).

Dropout Rates

Mothers are expected to invest a fair amount of time in carrying out the HIPPY activities: two activities per day, five days a week, for 60 weeks over a two-year period. In view of this, it is not surprising that some mothers dropped out. Indeed, many illiterate mothers, single-parent families and multi-problem families are excluded from participation in HIPPY programs in Israel and Turkey since they are extremely likely to drop out. In Holland no mothers are excluded for these reasons. Therefore, it is relevant to examine whether mothers with these disadvantages had higher dropout rates.

Nearly 60% of the mothers stayed in the program (similar to the dropout rate in the Israeli pilot study in Tel Aviv). About 80% of those who dropped out did so in the first year, most of them in the first six months. The dropout rates varied remarkably between ethnic groups, with the highest rate in the Dutch group and the lowest in the Moroccan group. Local group factors also influenced the dropout rate. For example, in one of the Turkish groups, more than half of the mothers dropped out in the initial phase because of a poorly functioning paraprofessional.

The dropout figures were divided into two categories: technical dropout (including mothers who moved to another neighborhood or mothers who did not meet the program criteria, e.g., because of too high an educational level) and program dropout. Thirty five percent of the mothers fell into the category of program dropout. They left for a variety of reasons, including health problems, being too busy with household activities, being overburdened with family and financial problems, or because they had found a job. Mothers with a low educational level dropped out of the program significantly less than mothers with a higher educational level. Unemployment of the father had no impact on dropout rate; nor did the fact that a family was led by a single-parent.

CONCLUSIONS

The experimental HIPPY/OPSTAP project was terminated in June 1991. The children and mothers were tested and interviewed again. The findings are to be published in 1992. In the final report, there will be a comparison of the populations in various HIPPY experiments, specifically the OPSTAP Amsterdam experiment, the HIPPY Tel Aviv project and the HIPPY Istanbul project.

Although the similarity in the cultural and socioeconomic aspects of the Dutch and Israeli populations was one of the main arguments for using the HIPPY program in the Netherlands, differences between the target groups in these countries made a few modifications inevitable. The most striking modification was the language in which the program was offered - i.e., the mother's native tongue. This worked well for the Turkish mothers, but not so well for the Moroccan mothers, who were mostly illiterate and relied heavily on an older sibling to carry out the activities with the child.

The main conclusion of the implementation of the program is that the target group - i.e., disadvantaged ethnic minority families - was reached. Mothers with a low level of education were more likely to stay in the program than those with more years of schooling, and children with unemployed fathers did not drop out more often than ones with working fathers.

Drs. Pieter Appelhof
School Advisory Center, Utrecht, the Netherlands

Ever since the introduction of compulsory education in the Netherlands in 1918, the country has been concerned with providing good education to poor families. In the late 1970s, the influx of immigrants to Holland led to the establishment of an educational policy for immigrant children that was distinct from the policy for deprived Dutch children. These separate policy programs were integrated into the national Educational Priority Policy in 1986. One of the features of educational policy in Holland is that the government is not permitted to interfere with the contents of instruction. Schools have great autonomy in deciding what to teach and how to teach it. The objective of the Educational Priority Policy is very broad: improvement of achievement levels of scholastic skills, as well as of non-cognitive skills.

The policy has two components: (i) extra facilities (particularly, an augmented teaching staff) to schools with many deprived children, and (ii) specially earmarked priority areas. About half of Holland's 8,500 schools are eligible for extra facilities. Eligibility is determined by a point system. A weight of 1.25 is allotted to a disadvantaged Dutch pupil, defined as a child with at least one parent having a low educational level; a weight of 1.9 is allotted to an immigrant pupil, defined as a child with at least one parent born in one of a list of qualifying countries; and non-disadvantaged children are allotted a weight of 1. The school's pupil ratings determines its number of teachers. For example, a school that is made up entirely of pupils with a 1.9 score has twice as many teachers as a school that is composed entirely of 1-point pupils (without disadvantaged or immigrant pupils).

The second component of the policy is the creation of 70 priority areas, earmarked for special attention. These areas consist of local or regional cooperative networks of schools (primary and secondary), welfare

institutions, public libraries, community centers and other institutions. The networks have governing boards and coordinators. Schools in these areas are free to participate in the network.

Priority area schools have been found to have a relatively high proportion of ethnic-minority pupils, whereas schools outside priority areas, yet receiving extra facilities, have many pupils of relatively low socioeconomic status. Two thirds of pupils in schools without extra facilities do not belong to the target group.

EVALUATION OF THE PRIORITY POLICY

The research design is a combination of a longitudinal and cross-sectional design. Every other year, language, math and intelligence tests are administered in primary schools throughout Holland. In 1988, about 40,000 pupils in 700 primary schools were tested. Results showed that deprived Dutch pupils are slightly below the mean in math and language achievements. The difference in the scores of the immigrant pupils is dramatic; they score over one standard deviation below the norm. Moreover, there is a clear relationship between test scores and country of origin.

The study compared results between five categories of schools with disadvantaged pupils:

1. Schools without extra facilities (few disadvantaged pupils).
2. Schools in priority areas (many disadvantaged Dutch pupils).
3. Schools outside priority areas (many disadvantaged Dutch pupils).
4. Schools in priority areas (many immigrant pupils).
5. Schools outside priority areas (many immigrant pupils).

The results show that there is no difference between categories in the number of students with learning or behavioral problems, or the number of pupils referred to special education.

Priority area schools give extra attention to cognitive skills. Schools in the second and third categories attached great importance to gearing instruction to the pupil's level of development. The staff of priority area schools were better informed about the Educational Priority Policy than were the staff of other schools (even those receiving extra facilities as a result of this policy). Schools in the priority areas with many immigrant children are distinguished from all other schools in the considerable emphasis put on enhancing achievement levels, and the small amount of attention paid to non-cognitive skills. It should be noted that the participation rate of priority area schools in activities available to them is not very high.

Few schools were found to pay more than lip service to the principles which research has shown to be beneficial in the education of disadvantaged

pupils. It is obvious that immigrant children whose mother tongue is not Dutch are in need of additional instruction in that language. However, half the teachers with immigrant children in their classrooms stated that they never provide additional language instruction, while three quarters said they used no special methods. In this respect, schools in priority areas distinguish themselves positively from other schools, as their main concern is to improve basic skills.

In conclusion, implementation of the Educational Priority Policy has not been altogether successful. However, in priority areas where a coordinated network has been created, the implementation has been better than in schools that receive only extra facilities. The latter groups' participation in the priority policy is largely administrative. The system of pupil rights works well in allocating facilities to the schools with the most urgent needs. However, the criteria are so broad that nearly half of all pupils in school are defined as "at risk." The study found that nearly half the pupils with a 1.25 score (deprived Dutch pupils), as well as many pupils with parents born in Mediterranean countries (1.9), are not, in fact, at risk. Thus, the criteria for disadvantaged pupils needs to be redefined. A deprived Dutch pupil should be one with both parents having a low educational level. However, as this redefinition may lead to reductions in school staff, it is likely to provoke strong public debate and resistance from the teachers' union.

Inside priority areas, the policy has been implemented much better than outside the areas. If schools are left on their own, they use the extra facilities to solve practical problems or to reduce class size. Schools with many immigrant pupils show the most dramatic improvement as a result of their emphasis on basic skills. There is a gap between broad policy aims and the activities in the schools. More second-language instruction is desirable, but this cannot be imposed owing to the autonomy of schools.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HIPPY/OPSTAP

The implementation data of the Educational Priority Policy offer several lessons for the OPSTAP/HIPPY program. First, not only should HIPPY be carried out in Holland in educational priority areas (which is already the case), but there should be greater efforts to more fully integrate the program into the existing networks of activities. The effect of HIPPY can be strengthened by linking it with such frameworks as libraries and day care centers.

Second, one criterion for selecting Dutch HIPPY children should be that both the father and mother have low educational levels. This would be in keeping with a more accurate definition of deprived Dutch pupils.

Third, schools in educational priority areas with many ethnic-minority children have difficulty coping, but have made the decision to teach basic

skills. These schools would also appreciate the philosophy behind the HIPPY program and would agree that "being a good pupil starts at home." There is an ongoing debate in Holland in which some intellectuals argue that HIPPY is not flexible enough. However, those educators working in priority area schools with many ethnic children would probably disagree.

Fourth, Turkish and Moroccan mothers work with HIPPY in their home language. However, as the child must become a good pupil in a Dutch school, it might be more efficient to offer the parents the possibility of learning Dutch with their children. At the very least, the HIPPY books should be printed in two languages.

Prof. Dan Davis
The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education
Israel

The following is a report of a study carried out in the late 1970s, evaluating HIPPY in Israel. The study was designed by Dr. Yaacov Kareev of the Hebrew University's School of Education, together with Ms. Paula Silberstein. The original aim of the study was to examine the effect of HIPPY on math and reading achievements in first and second grades. However, a high dropout rate soon became a serious concern. As Dr. Kareev was on sabbatical at the time, I was asked to step in and examine the dropout problem, together with Ms. Silberstein. The main variable of the research soon changed, because one of the reasons for dropout was non-normative progression through the school system. In other words, many children who were tested in grade one never entered grade two, having instead been placed in special education. Consequently, the main research variable became the effect of HIPPY on normative or non-normative progress through the school system.

The design was quasi-experimental. Children could not be assigned to HIPPY at random, as the program was implemented in specific neighborhoods. Therefore, the researchers sought out control neighborhoods that resembled the HIPPY ones. In order to control for community, family and school differences, each child in the study was linked with an older sibling attending the same school (it was the younger sibling who had been in the HIPPY program, so as to rule out the spillover effect between siblings). There were 206 such sibling pairs altogether, from six communities (93 in HIPPY and 113 in the control group).

Among other things, the study compared HIPPY and control children in terms of normative or non-normative progression through the school system. Excluding children who dropped out for such extraneous reasons as sickness, the study focused on those younger children who either moved normally to the next grade or had educational problems - i.e., were left behind a grade, were put into special education or were put into a special class. A younger child was considered to be at low risk if his/her older sibling had no

educational problems and at high risk if his/her older sister or brother did. Overall, there was a drop in educational problems of children who took part in HIPPY (see Table). In the low-risk category (176 subjects), there is a significant difference in favor of HIPPY, whereas in the high-risk category (30 subjects), the program had no real effect. However, due to the small size of the high-risk category, this result is inconclusive.

Educational Problems of HIPPY and Control Children

Educational Problems (Younger Child)		Low Risk		High Risk		Total	
		HIPPY	Control	HIPPY	Control	HIPPY	Control
Yes	N (%)	7 (9)	25 (26)	6 (46)	8 (47)	13 (14)	33 (29)
No	N (%)	73 (91)	71 (74)	7 (54)	9 (53)	80 (86)	80 (71)
Total	N (%)	80(100)	96(100)	13(100)	17(100)	93(100)	113(100)

The study also examined the results of achievement tests in math and reading. The scores of the older siblings (when in first and second grade) were compared to the scores of the younger siblings a few years later, when the latter were in first and second grade. The researchers then compared HIPPY and control children in terms of the difference between the younger child's scores and his or her older sibling's scores. Because of the differential dropout rate of children from the regular school, there is a bias against the experimental group (HIPPY kept weaker children in the system, while in the control group, they dropped out). This bias was taken into account by calculating two different estimates: one using the data as is, the other disregarding the weakest pairs of the HIPPY group.

When all data are taken into account, there was a .16 difference (in standard deviation) in favor of the HIPPY children. This is in terms of standard deviation of the whole group; if this is seen in terms of standard deviation of the control group, the figure becomes .22-.25, a moderate or small difference. When the correction is made for the differential dropout rate, the standard deviation is .41 in terms of the whole group. In terms of standard deviation of the control group, the figure rises to .50. There was a greater effect on math than on reading, and little difference was found between first and second grade results, with a very slight preference in the direction of a first-grade effect. It should be noted that not all pairs of

children took all the tests, so that there are some missing data. However, an analysis for only those siblings who had taken all the tests produced results similar to those of the main study.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A question was raised about the rather high rate of low-risk control children with educational problems (26%). Prof. Davis replied that the base rate of older siblings at risk is about 15%; for younger siblings, 25%. Birth order could account, at least partially, for the difference, with older siblings tending to do considerably better than younger ones.

Another participant asked whether there was an increase in the number of children sent to special education during the course of the study. Prof. Davis said this was not the case; non-HIPPY communities had not been found to have invested money in other special programs.

Asked how the data were viewed by policy-makers, it was stated that the difference in the low-risk population, which is the majority, was considered quite significant. In actuality, there were two different risks involved: the sibling risk and the socio-economic risk. While there might be some correlation between the two, this has not been examined. High risk populations are far from being homogeneous. The lesson is to consider high-risk populations as very diversified. This is not the view held by most policy-makers. The high- versus low-risk categories is one way of making finer distinctions among disadvantaged families.

Another participant told of an additional study that used older siblings as a control. The study in question examined older siblings who had not been in a supplemental food program for pregnant nursing mothers in the USA. It found that the older siblings suffered greater cognitive disadvantages in school than their younger siblings, who had taken part in the program.

Dr. Chaya Piotrkowski
The NCJW Center for the Child, USA

HIPPY began in the USA in 1984. HIPPY USA today includes 8,000 families. There are 50 programs in 16 states, half of which are in Arkansas, where it is state-supported. All other HIPPY programs are supported locally, meaning the onus is on each community to find its own funding sources. As a result, the criteria for selecting HIPPY parents varies somewhat, depending on the criteria set by the funding organization (i.e., if the funding is for job training, the program is seen as a job-training program for mothers). However, by and large, HIPPY serves parents who are very poor and have very low educational levels.

In the USA, the approach to research has been to study existing HIPPY programs (rather than to set up HIPPY programs for the purpose of studying them). In 1988, the NCJW Center for the Child started to look at HIPPY as a set of research and demonstration projects, in the hope of also offering technical assistance in the establishment of new projects. The Center is involved in two main research activities today - the HIPPY Research Consortium and the evaluation of several existing HIPPY programs.

HIPPY RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

The consortium grew out of a series of discussions among various people in the USA interested in doing research on HIPPY. It began as a planning group to set up a systematic multi-site evaluation of the HIPPY program, involving a systematic examination of implementation as it relates to outcome. In other words, the researchers were interested in studying how programs varied in different communities and how this variation affected outcome. Consequently, the study includes both implementation and outcome questions.

The group has been meeting for 18 months to develop this large-scale evaluation. To date, they have identified some common research questions, some common research constructs, and agreed on some common research measures. Several key research questions are:

1. How communities take ownership and adopt HIPPY?
2. Shared patterns of participation in HIPPY.
3. Language dominance: what happens in communities where English is a second language, an especially relevant question in Spanish-speaking communities in the USA. The idea of this research is to describe how language decisions are made, and what values they reflect.
4. How HIPPY relates to other services, an important issue given the strong interest in comprehensive services in the USA.
5. The kind of parenting ideology that is communicated through the program. The goal is to make implicit messages explicit.

On the level of outcome, the group agreed on a few core questions:

1. Does participation enhance school functioning, school readiness and psycho-social development of children?
2. Does participation enhance parental development, including economic self-sufficiency?
3. Does participation enhance family literacy?
4. Does participation enhance the parent-child relationship? Does it enhance increased parental involvement in their children's education?

For each of these questions, the domains of the constructs have been identified; on some, there is agreement on measures. Other questions of interest raised by the group include: what happens to paraprofessionals and

their families as a result of being involved in HIPPY, and what happens to the siblings of HIPPY children?

This research project should cost about $3.5 million over four years if it is carried out in 9 to 12 potential sites. Since it is unlikely that such funding can be obtained, the group is looking at an alternative model: a set of linked studies.

EVALUATION OF THREE HIPPY PROGRAMS

A three-year grant from the USA Ministry of Education will finance a longitudinal, long-term evaluation of three HIPPY programs sponsored by school systems in West Memphis, Arizona; Yonkers, New York; and Grand Rapids, Michigan. The study is a quasi-experimental pre- and post-test design, with the exception of the Yonkers site, where children are assigned to the program on a random basis. The sites are ethnically diverse, with West Memphis being primarily black, and Grand Rapids, Hispanic. The study includes 300 HIPPY families and 300 control families. Control families were recruited in the same way that HIPPY families were recruited so as to minimize self-selection bias. Preliminary analysis shows no significant difference in the variables of the experimental and control groups.

Pre-test data include the cooperative preschool inventory, a measure of school readiness. Researchers are administering this test, rather than teachers, because a Yonkers pilot study found that the teachers affected the results. Pre-test data are also being collected on: children's achievements, parental literacy, the home, parental attitudes towards children's education, and depression in mothers. The latter measure is used in light of Head Start studies that showed that the level of depression affected the mother's level of participation. Depression is also regarded as an important predictor of the parent-child relationship.

Process data to be gathered include: the number of group meetings parents attend, the content of those meetings, and the number of home visits that are completed. Families, coordinators and administrators are to be interviewed on their visions of the program. The study will also look at how much HIPPY is expected to cost versus how much it actually costs, an important issue for policy-makers.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A Dutch representative commented that, in the Netherlands, HIPPY is highly centralized in terms of funding. She was struck by the diversity of funding sources in the USA, suggesting that this affects the quality of paraprofessionals, and makes it difficult to compare various projects. Dr. Piotrkowski agreed, saying this is precisely why a multi-site evaluation was decided upon. The need to "hustle" for money tends to shape the program.

Dr. Raymond Collins
HIPPY Research Consortium, USA

The purpose of HIPPY MIS (a computerized Management Information System) is twofold: it is a tool for monitoring or quality control (i.e., program management), and it is a research tool that can be especially useful, given the decentralized nature of HIPPY USA, which has national, state and local levels. Breakthroughs in computer software and hardware have made possible forms of data gathering and retrieval that were not conceivable even two or three years ago.

There are several design principles underlying the MIS approach. First, HIPPY MIS will serve all purposes, replacing the current multiple system and thereby eliminating duplication. Second, data are to be entered once, but can be used for many different reports and forms. Third, HIPPY MIS starts with data on the child and family, and includes key program information, such as home visits and periodic progress reports. Fourth, community level data is to be the foundation of national data, building from the bottom up, instead of from the top down, as most research systems in the USA tend to do. This means that the data are collected from the program implementors rather than the researchers. Finally, other program management and research needs are analyzed to complement and validate the MIS. The intent of this is to avoid unnecessary duplication. This above all calls for a degree of trust and partnership on the part of researchers and implementors. They must have faith in the quality of the data so as not to engage in the redundant process of collecting their own data.

How does one design a trustworthy computerized system, given that program management and research projects do not stand still while the system is under development? The MIS team took a step-by-step approach based on consultation with implementors of HIPPY, in response to their needs. They began by analyzing information needs, on the basis of experience with the CDI, experience in the research planning consortium and discussions with the staff of HIPPY USA.

The next step was to design eight forms:

1. The optional family application.
2. The family profile.
3. Services provided to the HIPPY family.
4. Home-visit scheduling.
5. The paraprofessional's home-visit report.
6. The monthly coordinator's report.
7. Background on the paraprofessional.
8. Background on the community.

It should be noted that forms 1 and 2 are now being consolidated at the request of implementors. Moreover, form 4 (home-visit scheduling) could

be used both by the paraprofessional and in the monthly coordinator's report.

Local programs were asked by HIPPY USA to implement these forms. Programs in Arkansas were mandated to begin using them by fall 1991. Their use is strongly encouraged in all programs and is mandated in all new HIPPY sites nationwide beginning in the fall. Selected forms (the monthly coordinator's report and the services provided by the HIPPY program) were mandated for all programs beginning immediately, under the assumption that the old forms are not of much value.

After the forms were tried out on the community level, a brief questionnaire was sent out asking for comments on the forms and the type of computers in use at the site. Responses to the questionnaire came in very quickly. Efforts were also made to obtain feedback from training leaders and through informal ongoing discussions with HIPPY USA, the Center for the Child, and Arkansas Children's Hospital. On the basis of all this feedback, the forms have been revised.

The next step was to develop computer software for the MIS. The system chosen was the personal computer, with IBM or IBM-type software. This will be a requirement for HIPPY programs in the USA. While this is a problem for many schools that use Apple (Macintosh) software, which is incompatible with IBM, nonetheless IBM was judged to be more appropriate for the MIS. In addition to developing software, users' guides and reports were developed, with much thought given to the range of reports that users might want to produce. The intent is to have a set menu that local programs can choose from. The data would be collected on a form, fed into the computer, and updated regularly. The most up-to-date data or the most "current version of reality" would always be accessible on the computer, rather than on written forms in someone's desk.

The next step in the development of HIPPY MIS was the training of four sites (in Tulsa, Oklahoma). Finally, the system will be turned over to HIPPY USA by March 1992. Researchers in HIPPY International may want to give some thought to core aspects of data that are common across countries for the purposes of cross-national comparisons.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

One participant emphasized how important the MIS is from a research perspective, even though it is primarily a program tool. Because of the decentralization of HIPPY in the USA, it has been impossible to obtain a total picture of programs country-wide, since each program is responsible to its own sponsors. From a research perspective, the MIS contains not only background information on families, but also information concerning the process. This enables researchers to abandon the "black box" approach, which stresses outcome without examining process variables. One

goal of the Center for the Child is to link the MIS data with research data.

One of the Dutch delegates noted that members of her staff are in the process of developing a monitoring system. She suggested that the Dutch group discuss and coordinate their efforts with the Americans in order to ensure that the systems enable comparisons between the two countries.

Another participant suggested that more attention be paid to another level of the process, specifically the parent-child interaction. Yet another felt that the MIS was not designed for such research, despite the real need. Dr. Collins raised the possibility of eventually finding a way to "marry" two databases: the standardized MIS data and the more fine-grained data that evolve out of research.

Dr. David Weikart
Director, High/Scope Foundation, USA

In the 1960s, it was widely believed that early childhood education programs would harm children. While this has changed dramatically, giving way to a much more social activist approach, there is now a need to temper social activism with more concrete knowledge. A study done by Joan McCord tracked down 525 men at the age of 50 who had been in an intervention program for delinquency prevention in their youth. In the immediate aftermath of the program, many of the participants testified as to how much it had changed their lives and expressed the intention of pursuing a university education. However, at age 50, it was discovered that those who had been in the program were significantly more delinquent than those who had not participated. They were also more suicidal and more criminally ill. The researcher suggests that the children in the program got habituated to the idea of having a future. Moreover, when they had problems, society was there for them during the program. But once the program was over, society did not deliver.

Whatever the explanation, the lesson is that it is not enough to go out and "do good." There is a need to know exactly what is happening in the process. This obviously holds true for HIPPY. The second lesson is that there must be key studies that are good enough to examine the long-term effect of programs on people. While current thought suggests that the earlier intervention takes place, the better, there are no data to support this view. In fact, the data of a ten-year six-site Ford study (soon to be released) suggest that the ideal age, the "peak," is at age four.

Regarding the magnitude of impact, one should examine real world outcomes rather than changes in IQ or test scores. Experiences of the 1960s show that while high-quality intervention could raise IQ up to 30 points, this was later followed by deterioration. If a program works, it should result in a significant difference between the experimental and control group that is intuitively meaningful to the hard-nosed outsider.

In evaluating the cost of a program, there is a need to calculate the long-term cost to society. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project cost $1 for program participants over the period from birth to age 29 or 30. However, over the same period, the cost for control children who did not take part in the program was $6 apiece. One must ask which is the more expensive program: the one that provided services to children, or the one that "saved" money by not providing services?

A study of the same children at age 30 is now being completed. Preliminary, though as yet not final data show some stunning results. For example, one out of three children in the control group have, by age 30, become habitual felons. In the experimental group, the figure was one in 15. While the final data will not be ready for about another year, the pattern is evident.

Moving to the subject of teaching styles, curriculum approaches can be placed within a quadrant, where one axis represents the degree of teacher initiative, and the other represents child initiative (see Figure). In custodial frameworks, neither child nor teacher takes much initiative; the child is cared for but there is no planned program nor options available to him or her. In programmed learning, the child waits for the teacher to take charge; the assumption is that the teacher holds the knowledge. In the child-centered, theme-based approach, the children are left to solve their problems. In the open framework, the teacher takes the initiative from a theoretical position of understanding the needs of the children, and the children are responsible for making their own decisions (this is suitable, for instance, with high-school students).

Curriculum Approaches

CHILD INITIATIVE	TEACHER INITIATIVE: YES	TEACHER INITIATIVE: NO
YES	Open Framework	Child-Centered Theme-Based
NO	Programmed Learninig	Custodian

There is a big divide between the child waiting for direction and the child taking the initiative. The problem with the HIPPY program is that materials require little child initiative. This is in contrast to the strategies in most nursery programs today, which are child-centered and theme-based. The concern about the HIPPY program stems from the results of a recent longitudinal High/Scope study which compared the impact of high-quality programs that provide programmed learning, an open framework or are child-centered (in one of the few studies to look at the outcome of the custodial approach, Kagitcibasi and colleagues found negative results: nothing happened). Initial findings, immediately after program completion, show that all three types of programs improved IQ and school achievement. At age 15, while there continued to be no difference in the academic abilities of the children in the various groups, there was a marked social difference: the children (both boys and girls) who had been in programmed learning were more than twice as delinquent as the ones in the other groups. This strongly suggests that what a child at age four is learning relates to some of the traditional theoretical discussions of Freud, Erikson and others, concerning initiative, responsibility and independence. The foundations for these characteristics are laid at that age, which is probably what makes age four so important.

DISCUSSION

Another participant noted that, in the Soviet Union, education in both the school and home fits into the programmed learning approach, yet not everyone becomes delinquent. What helped people survive and become creative despite the rigid system was the contacts and communication they established with friends or with books. This is the importance of HIPPY: it gives mothers a new style of communicating with children. The idea is to make the mothers not only more successful teachers, but also more successful communicators. Given that, there is a need for more research on the process of interaction between mother and child in HIPPY. There should be objective criteria for assessing communication skills.

The open discussion that was sparked by the above report touched upon a variety of issues relating to implementation and research of home-based programs such as HIPPY. Many of these ideas were developed later on. Prof. Lombard closed the discussion by saying that the reports given have made it clear that HIPPY is working. The system of delivery appears to be working and the materials appear to be serving the purpose they were designed for. One of the problematic issues that has been identified is language: in what language does it work, with whom, and under what circumstances? A second important question is: who doesn't make it in HIPPY and why? Some people are dropping out. Moreover, not all the families that need HIPPY are being reached, and literacy may be a barrier. These are some of the factors that are still unknown.

GROUP DISCUSSION

A matrix was assembled to illustrate what is known about HIPPY and what remains to be known. In the course of the discussion, the participants decided upon several dimensions of the matrix: what is already known about HIPPY; the degree of assuredness to which these things are known; the degree to which these findings are applicable in different cultural settings; how important each of the factors is; and the critical indicators of what is known.

Under the heading of what is known about HIPPY, the group decided upon the following broad categories: the child (functioning in school, as well as effect on child's work and life); the program (materials, delivery, staff and the developmental appropriateness of the program); the parent; mother-child interaction; the home environment; home visitors; the school and the community.

The representative of High/Scope referred to the Perry Preschool Study, which found that children in the experimental group who were assigned to special education did better in that framework than their counterparts in the control group. This suggests that an effective program may make the child more competent and better able to negotiate with his or her environment, even if it is a poor one. Another American delegate added that, even though most schools are ill-prepared for HIPPY and other disadvantaged children, HIPPY children might be more successful at negotiating any system in which they find themselves.

An Israeli participant maintained that the task of HIPPY is to prepare children to function in the schools as they are. While efforts can be made to reform the educational system, that is not a research agenda. Educators involved with HIPPY face a certain philosophical dilemma: while the goal of the program is to improve cognitive abilities, the real worth of the program should be assessed not only on the basis of how it prepares children for school, which is an artificial environment, but on how it prepares them for life. One of the American delegates argued that school is not an artificial environment, but rather a primary socialization agent that prepares people for work and life. It is no more artificial than the family, work place or university. Therefore one should not dismiss school results. How children do in school can have tremendous consequences in their lives. The South African delegate countered by saying the acceptance of schools as they are is unthinkable in South Africa, where one of the goals of education has been to keep blacks uneducated and oppressed. One must ask whether the goal of HIPPY is to equip black children for the school system that the government has set up for them. One must redefine educational philosophy rather than meet the status quo.

There was also discussion about the type of pupil skills that should be instilled by HIPPY, independent of the type of school. An Israeli delegate suggested that children need to be taught to sit still, to concentrate, to interact with an adult, to ask questions, to answer questions. An American representative countered that it is more important to instill curiosity, independence, decision-making skill, and originating conversation ability - none of which are criteria for HIPPY. Another Israeli participant reminded the group that the target population of HIPPY in any country are children "at risk" because of their low socioeconomic status and ethnic origin. If a child like this flunks second grade because he or she couldn't concentrate, the opportunity to develop initiative and independence is lost. Hence, basic student skills are very important. Even in South Africa, there is no question that blacks must learn to read and write. Moreover, it is necessary to recognize the limited role that most parents and teachers actually play as agents of social change. What HIPPY aims to instill in a child are the very things that prepare a child for school. Another American delegate suggested that there is a big difference between the way desired goals and outcomes are formulated and the specific skills that are called for in a particular piece of the curriculum. These two elements should not be confused. The choice between the more circumscribed list of skills (using pencils, concentrating, etc.) and the broader skills (curiosity, initiative, etc.) is a major strategic decision. It should not be based on what was intended 20 years ago, but rather on where one wants to be 20 years hence.

SUBJECTS FOR FURTHER STUDY

It was agreed that there is a need to clarify the research agenda with regard to what should be studied. Dr. Piotrkowski made the following report of some of the discussions on research design in the USA:

While the USA research group was interested in describing process variables, they started with the assumption that the HIPPY model aims at obtaining two major outcomes - school functioning and parental involvement. Researchers in the USA realized that there was a core model with which they could all identify (that included role-playing, curriculum materials, the use of paraprofessionals), but that within that there was a lot of variation. It is important to examine that variation in order to understand outcomes. Thus, the group set about systematically identifying the sources of variation. They identified six major sources, some of which are specific to the USA: service, population, administration, coordination, additional activities sponsored by HIPPY for parents, and links with other family services.

The service component refers to how HIPPY is provided to program participants. This includes such variables as duration of the program, paraprofessionals, method of instruction, role and importance of group meetings.

The population component includes variation in the communities, in particular the level of disadvantagedness, the socioeconomic status, ethnicity, cultural background, language, variety in the local educational system, other services available in the community, and the rate of unemployment and crime in the community.

The administration component refers to who initiates, runs and pays for HIPPY. The range of such bodies in the USA includes job training programs, local NCJW chapters, school districts, community-based organizations, and, in one instance, a local video store operator. How does the funding or implementing source influence various aspects of the program, including selection criteria and how the program is perceived?

The coordination component refers to who directs the program on the local level. This includes the background of the coordinator, the supervision he or she gets, the vision of the coordinator, the input he or she has, and the nature and function of local advisory groups.

Other participants of the workshop proposed the following additional variables for study:

- The size of the group (e.g., a small size may enable the coordinator to pay more attention to family problems).
- The catchment area and the group's degree of cultural diversity.
- The employment conditions of the coordinator.
- The length of time that the coordinator has been training the para-professionals.
- The societal context, specifically the position of the target group in society.

Dr. Piotrkowski continued her report saying that researchers in the USA are taking one of three approaches: (i) case studies to describe process; (ii) larger scale survey and outcome research; and (iii) intensive studies that examine such factors as parent-child interaction that require fine-tuning and small samples.

An Israeli participant suggested three possible routes for joint activity: (i) to obtain a profile of all HIPPY programs worldwide, so as to have an inventory of all HIPPY activities; (ii) to carry out case studies of Turkish, South African and Israeli experiments, taking into account the major cultural and social differences between them; and (iii) to study outcome variables, incorporating some input variables and a limited list of crucial process variables. This latter course would allow researchers to analyze cultural and social variables on an international scale, providing a worldwide map of input, process and output.

One of the American delegates proposed two possible strategies for defining measures of fidelity to a model: to consider the outcomes of programs that highly approximate the model, or to study all programs, irrespective of their degree of fidelity. One could also examine the difference in outcome in terms of how much the program varies from the model. However, one of the Israeli representatives objected to the concept of fidelity, arguing that multilingual or multiracial groups would not necessarily fit the model. Instead, he suggested that researchers study multilingual and unilingual groups, looking for outcome differences.

The South African delegate preferred to first identify program goals and then design research to study whether these goals are fulfilled. An American delegate insisted that there should be a clear separation of program and research, with the people who run the programs defining them.

A Dutch delegate suggested that certain essential elements must be shared by a program, and that variations can be documented through case studies. The hope was expressed that the present meeting would lead to some sort of international data collection in the near future. Another Dutch delegate urged the group to define the elements of the program to be researched. She suggested such core variables as the mother as mother, the mother as mediator, and the child. As a policy-maker, HIPPY interests her because it is a two-generational program.

SHARED RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES

A discussion ensued over how to measure the impact of HIPPY. An Israeli delegate called for a standard evaluation model. Researchers should decide on the "ideal" HIPPY, find a random control group, and ensure that the program is fully implemented within that research design. Moreover, effect can only be demonstrated when there are at most two HIPPY groups (the second being a variation). This approach would provide a well-documented estimate of something that was actually implemented, which is an important starting point. With a program as complex as HIPPY, it is impossible to create a good design that estimates the independent effects of all aspects of the program. One of the American representatives was sceptical that an ideal model of HIPPY could be found. This must be checked empirically rather than assumed. Hence, this proposal is not a viable research strategy for HIPPY in the USA. Instead, what is needed are strategies for researching diversity in the world.

A Dutch delegate argued that the research design should include at least a minimum of input, process and outcome variables, to make the study as comparable as possible. In the Netherlands, outcomes are important for policy-making. She further suggested that researchers keep the number of studied variables to a minimum, so that these could be explored in greater detail. For instance, if duration is examined, this would not only cover the number of weeks that mothers participated, but also the types of activities that were carried out. Similarly, a study of paraprofessionals would not only consider the number of home visits, but also how the program is modelled.

The South African representative suggested a two-pronged research approach: study of variation within each country, and international research that examined commonalty of effect across countries. An Israeli delegate stated that revealed differences in outcomes are not necessarily a function of the independent variables, but rather could reflect "noises" in the HIPPY program, i.e., variables specific to certain locations. This situation can only be corrected by pinpointing these "noises" and including them in the input. For instance, a question that is commonly raised is whether the mother's adherence to expectations affects her self-concept. This is not included systematically as a variable in studies, even though it is included in the description of output. Nor do we know whether coordinator's background (in education, psychology, etc.) has an impact on mothers.

The South African representative proposed two strategies for joint research. First, the program should be defined explicitly to reduce variation and to permit a cross-cultural study. Second, researchers should examine the relative effectiveness of process (as opposed to content), i.e., how the

extent to which the parent communicates with the child affects outcome. An American delegate proposed organizing a long-term sample benchmark study that would enable researchers to pinpoint expectations when a HIPPY program is implemented. He also proposed a pure case study, using a cultural anthropological rather than a classical approach, with the aim of exploring and documenting variation. An Israeli delegate indicated that it is important to study what happens in the home - between the home visitor and the mother, and between the mother and the child. What motivates the home visitor to keep going? What intangible factors are at play? What is the impact on the household? One of the American delegates suggested that carefully controlled classic research designs, aimed at providing implementors with valuable information on specific questions, were valuable. An example is a study to determine whether a program for three-year-olds should be added in a site where a program for four- and five-year-olds exists. A study to determine what incentives could be used to make parents stay in the program would also fit into this category.

An Israeli representative suggested that researchers agree to use the MIS for gathering information on process, even if there is no consensus yet on what to do with that information later on. There is a strong need for systematic monitoring of what is happening in HIPPY. While data are being gathered on a local level, they are not sufficiently used on a broader scale. The data may also yield certain types of outcome data; for instance, they might reveal that output is the same regardless of of whether a mother works with her child once a week or five times a week.

On the basis of the above discussion, a matrix was created summarizing the research that each country would like to perform. The following possibilities were raised:

1. **An international network of research**, to exchange information and share findings.

2. **MIS**, i.e., the computerized management information system.

3. **Implementation research** to examine the degree to which specific programs adhere to HIPPY's main principles.

4. **Summative evaluation**, which measures the immediate impact of a program by exploring input, process and outcome variables. The evaluation of outcome would take place in the immediate aftermath of the program.

5. **Follow-up research**, which examines longer-term outcomes or impact.

6. **Specific topics** - a more general type of implementation research that investigates variations (e.g., in mother-child interaction and in how paraprofessionals work), as well as how they affect outcomes.

The following table shows what each country is presently doing, and what each would like to do.

Current State of Research

	Israel	USA	Turkey	South Africa	The Netherlands
Research Network	•	•	•	•	•
MIS	•	+		•	•
Implementation Research		+•		•	+•
Summative Evaluation	+	+•	+	+•	+•
Follow-up	+•	•	+•	•	•
Specific Topics	+•	+		•	•

\+ Already doing.
• Would like to do.
+• Already doing, but would like to do more.

DISCUSSION OF MATRIX ITEMS

Network of Researchers

With regard to the implications of sharing outcome data, one of the American delegates cited an ongoing study in the USA on HIPPY in the context of a pre-school program. The Turkish HIPPY research also briefly mentions this topic. If each study came up with different findings on the value of HIPPY in pre-school, this could set the stage for cross-country collaboration. This small group collaboration would constitute a different approach than a large joint research study undertaken by all countries. One of the Israeli delegates suggested that if another meeting is held (in perhaps, 15 to 18 months' time), a couple of people should work in advance to develop a framework of questions and techniques. In other words, there should be a plan for the meeting that would enable participants to focus on a few specific issues that could be examined in all programs in HIPPY.

Management Information System

An Israeli representative stated that three of the programs now operating could make the transition to MIS with relative ease. This, however, requires a financial commitment. If it is agreed that the MIS is a good research source, we can recommend that it be adopted; we can even mandate its use for new programs. The group decided to strongly recommend that programs adopt a MIS system.

In addition, the following questions were raised: An American delegate noted that, in the USA, the decision to implement the MIS is made by program implementors and not by researchers. Who would make the decision to adopt the MIS on an international scale? A Dutch representative raised the question of the level at which monitoring should begin. She recommended that data collection begins at the grassroots level of mother and child, rather than at the level of paraprofessionals. An American delegate replied that, in the USA, a clear distinction is made between programming information and research information. The data collected via the MIS is data needed for implementors. Was the MIS to include questions of interest to researchers, the forms would become too long and the whole concept unfeasible. The question of protecting the confidentiality of subjects was also raised. An American delegate explained that there is a scrambling or coding technique.

Implementation Research

One of the American delegates commented that implementation or specific topic research is so important at this point that, without it, it may well be impossible to draw conclusions based on findings in different countries. There is no way of knowing that the data in one country represent something equivalent to the data in another country as far as the process, program, standards and quality are concerned. HIPPY researchers must have the means to show the rest of the research community that the program being studied is indeed "HIPPY" and that findings obtained are comparable with other HIPPY programs. Two different levels of implementation research were proposed: one aimed at examining what is shared in HIPPY programs, the other aimed at probing variation for the purpose of comparisons.

The Turkish delegate said that, after observing two HIPPY programs in Israel, she now believes that what is being done in Israel is not the same as what is being done in Turkey. The core is the same, but there are many other differences. She cited the group meetings in Turkey, in which the mother actively learns the worksheets, assuming the role of the child. In Israel, the coordinator just distributes the worksheets to the mothers. She therefore questioned whether HIPPY in Turkey is the same as in the Netherlands, in the USA, and in Israel. An American representative added that the black box approach assumes such variations are unimportant.

One of the Israeli delegates favored cross-fertilization between research and implementation. He referred to the IEA (International Association for Evaluation of Educational Research), which is one model for international research. However, he expressed fear that if rigorous assessment and streamlining is undertaken to make HIPPY more uniform, so as to give it fifty rather than five shared variables, the result would strengthen the tutor-oriented part of the program rather than the more open, participatory aspect of the program. An American delegate added that one approach favored in the USA is to outline the HIPPY model, to determine where variation is permitted and where it is not, and then to take projects that were studied and assess them on those dimensions.

An attempt was then made to cite basic elements inherent to HIPPY, such as that it is home-based, includes group meetings, makes use of a professional coordinator and employs activity workbooks. It was suggested that some elements are critical to HIPPY, while others are acceptable variations (such as the language that is used). A question was raised as to the best forum to determine a checklist of critical components of HIPPY. Such a forum must include the coordinators and program operators in direct contact with the children, as well as the researchers with direct experience or involvement. One of the American delegates said she would like to discuss this with the consortium people in the USA, but that clearly this is not something that can be done by just one group. Specifying what HIPPY is concerns HIPPY International.

An Israeli delegate said each country could create its own checklist, rating each item on a 1-5 scale of importance. Then a pool of items, with an overlap of perhaps 20 items, could be obtained. She clarified that this checklist is not an absolute measure, but rather a gradation, enabling one to say that a certain HIPPY program does not meet the requirements, whereas another one is somewhat below average. The point is to have some mechanism of quantification that would permit implementation assessment. A Dutch delegate expressed concern that most programs might meet only 75% of the criteria. Do you then conclude that there are only one or two "real" HIPPY programs, or do you begin to eliminate criteria? An American delegate responded with the example of High/Scope. Some 20 criteria are each rated from 1 to 5. In order for a program to be called High/Scope it must have at least a 3 average; if it has at least a 4 average, its research findings are accepted. This minimum standard is decided on before assessing a program. Another American representatives reiterated that certain elements were critical to HIPPY (such as paraprofessional visits) and therefore could not be evaluated dimensionally.

The checklist of HIPPY criteria could also serve as a defense when programs are said "not to work." In many instances, it could well be that the actual program was not being implemented. It is necessary to develop the right set of questions to ask in the field, so as to come up with common dimensions and their descriptions. The national coordinators in the Netherlands have begun to do just that. Once the input of people working in the program is

received, a core group of HIPPY executives can make decisions at the top level.

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

One of the American delegates suggested that summative evaluations be postponed until a program is fully implemented and its validity is established. In the USA there is a consensus on this issue, in the aftermath of the Head Start experience in which researchers began studying programs too early. He proposed a two-step approach to research, whereby the first step consists of collecting data. An Israeli representative added that the existence of a tool for assessing implementation early on would be of help. Researchers could first assess programs; later on, appropriate programs could be chosen for the summative evaluation.

An American delegate referred to a research project in which High/Scope was asked by the IEA to coordinate a study of performance data of 12,000 four-year-old children in 15 countries. Ordinarily, cross-cultural comparisons are made through secondary sources, i.e., the results on national math, language, or other tests. In the IEA project, work teams from all countries were involved jointly in developing an instrument for assessing cognitive, perceptual, social, language, and other areas of child development over a two-year period. In the third year, each country tested the instrument in a field trial of 1,500 children. The researchers then met to examine each item individually, eliminating those that were unusable in particular countries (for instance, the mathematical concept of "a few" was eliminated because two of the participating countries had no such word or concept in their languages). The instrument was then used recently to assess the randomly selected group of 12,000 children from 15 countries. This instrument may be of use to HIPPY in conducting cross-country research of its own.

A discussion then ensued with respect to the results that should be evaluated. One delegate distinguished between immediate results, which are the aims of the program, and a more long-term outcome, i.e., the kind of transfer these skills have on school achievements. Another proposed the dimension of near and far transfer. The former refers to the more concrete goals and the latter to a transfer of skills that are used in real-life situations. Far transfer would mean observing the child in the course of a full day outside of the HIPPY framework. A distinction can also be made between skills that are directly related to the program and skills that are not, such as new socio-emotional behaviors. It was noted that, after children have been trained in some program, follow-up studies carried out a couple of years later often show no difference between experimental and control children. This possibility should be taken into account in devising and conducting long-term evaluation studies.

An Israeli delegate commented that, in the High/Scope program, educators strived for one outcome (school achievements) and got another (real-world differences). How does one know what outcome to look for? The High/Scope representative responded that in the course of graduate school discussions, tremendous disillusionment with IQ and achievement scores emerged. The participants felt that these scores only stood for real-world variables, whereas what they really wanted to measure were the real-world variables themselves. His group has hypothesized the reason for these dramatic differences but acknowledges that there is no existing theory to explain it.

DECISIONS ABOUT MATRIX ITEMS

With regard to the network of researchers, it was agreed that every new country entering HIPPY would be represented in the network. No more than two participants would be allowed from each country, for two reasons: a small group can achieve more than a large one, and owing to problems with funding, especially for new countries joining HIPPY. In defining the role of the research network, the following suggestions were made: exchange of information, meeting, planning, discussion of ongoing research and results, discussion of planning of research, and discussion of possible joint research.

An Israeli delegate suggested it would be fruitful to have a planning group to meet for a day to hammer out ideas. It was therefore decided to form a temporary ad hoc group who would help plan the next research meeting. The group consists of: Prof. Chaim Adler, representing the NCJW Research Institute; Dr. Chaya Piotrkowski, representing the NCJW Center for the Child; Prof. Lotty van den Berg-Eldering, representing Leiden University; and Prof. Mervyn Skuy, representing the University of the Witwatersrand. This group will also explore fund-raising possibilities. An American delegate proposed that the director of programming in the country where the meeting is held also be present, in addition to Avima Lombard. She recommended that in the future all research meetings should include one or two program people. Without this program input, there is the danger of becoming divorced from reality.

The question of funding the MIS was then raised. Should the researchers underwrite its cost, and should each country fund its own MIS? In the USA, the MIS is primarily a program tool that is paid for by program people. It is hard enough for researchers to come up with funding for research. There is more funding available for programming than for research, and it is unrealistic to expect researchers to subsidize the MIS in various countries. It was also agreed that each country be responsible for mobilizing its own funds for the MIS, even though this policy could lead to the exclusion of communities that cannot afford their own MIS, such as Mexico.

The group moved to a discussion of the checklist. Avima Lombard proposed that she and the national coordinators formulate the questions to be asked

in the field. Once the questions have been formulated, each national coordinator would create a list representing national input. This list would be finalized in a meeting of all the coordinators. Then the questions would be tried out.

An American delegate maintained that researchers should have a role in eliciting and clarifying the checklist. Another participant suggested beginning with the program people, then bouncing off their input with researchers (to check assumptions), and then bringing the revised checklist back to programmers. Eventually a small group, probably composed of both researchers and programmers, would make final decisions. Only when the checklist is complete will program people take it seriously. This must be taken into account in the time frame. It was suggested that people be given a time limit (e.g., 30 days) to respond to the input. This would prevent the process from being dragged out indefinitely.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

Everyone expressed interest in having a network of researchers. This network would be involved in the exchange of information about completed research and about research issues which are currently being dealt with. This group would also discuss past research in an attempt to arrive at a more substantive understanding of some of the issues involved. It would also be involved in planning and in deciding what sort of issues, if any, might be explored jointly in instrumentation. To make that part of the meeting more productive, a group of four will help plan the next meeting and will develop an agenda that reflects the issues raised here. It was decided that all countries involved in HIPPY should be invited, with each country represented by no more than two people. At least one program person from the host country should also be invited to participate.

It was recommended that all sites adopt the MIS. However, assistance in funding cannot be provided.

It was agreed that there is a need for an implementation assessment instrument. A checklist of items is to be created indicating the quality of a program. This checklist can then be used for research purposes to provide a secure basis for calling a program under study "HIPPY" (this checklist could be made part of the contract). In developing the checklist, Prof. Lombard would work with the national coordinators, elicit input from research and program people, and put the list out for trial. The whole thing, including the trial, should be completed within the course of this academic year.

It was agreed that summative evaluations not be undertaken in the first year a program is initiated. At most, the checklist would be used as a basis for ascertaining whether a program is ready to be evaluated and in that way satisfy the demands of policy-makers or funding organizations for data.

In the discussion of follow-up issues, it was agreed that a significant element to examine is transfer to areas other than HIPPY.

Specific research topics were not decided upon during this meeting, but many were listed and will be brought up over time.

A target date for the next research meeting was set for the beginning of 1993. It was agreed that Prof. Chaim Adler would serve as coordinator of the ad hoc planning group of that meeting, together with Dr. Chaya Piotrkowski, Prof. Lotty van den Berg-Eldering, and Prof. Mervyn Skuy. It was estimated that a budget of $50,000 would be needed to cover the cost of bringing 10 participants to two meetings of 3-4 days each. Funding for such a meeting was not available as of the date of publication of this report.

LIST OF SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

Prof. Chaim Adler	Israel
Mr. Benjamin Amir	Israel
Drs. Pieter Appelhof	The Netherlands
Dr. Sevda Bekman	Turkey
Dr. Raymond Collins	USA
Mr. Richard Cress	The Netherlands
Prof. Dan Davis	Israel
Ms. Mieke den Elt	The Netherlands
Prof. Avima Lombard	Israel
Dr. Chaya Piotrkowski	USA
Prof. Mervyn Skuy	South Africa
Ms. Tonny van den Berg	The Netherlands
Prof. Lotty van den Berg-Eldering	The Netherlands
Dr. David Weikart	USA

LIST OF SEMINR OBSERVERS

Ms. Kari Druck	Israel
Ms. Carol Ginsburg	Israel
Ms. Helene Levi	Israel
Ms. Sara Lior	Israel
Ms. Noemi Marcushamer	Israel
Dr. Elena Negnevitskaya	Israel